

Remarks**I. Telephone Message**

The Applicants sincerely appreciate the telephone message received from the Examiner on Wednesday, February 21, 2007, in response to the Applicants' question concerning hyperlinks in the patent application. In the message, the Examiner discussed the concerns of the USPTO relating to the presence of hyperlinks in patent applications.

II. Status of the Claims

Claims 1-21 are pending in the application. Claims 1-6, 9, 10-15, and 18 are amended. Claims 19-21 are added.

III. Objection to Specification

The specification has been objected to because the specification allegedly contains an embedded hyperlink and/or other form of browser-executable code. The section of the specification in question refers to "Radvision Ltd.'s "SIP: Protocol Overview" (2001), found at <http://www.radvision.com>." In response, the Applicants have amended the specification as shown above to remove the browser-executable code. Specifically, the character string "<http://www.radvision.com>" has been reduced to "www.radvision.com." No new matter has been added to the specification as a result of these amendments.

MPEP 608.01 (Part VII) indicates that the characters "<http://>" followed by a URL address constitutes a hyperlink. MPEP 608.01 additionally explains that hyperlinks within a patent application are problematic because, when the patent application is posted on the USPTO web page, the characters "<http://>" activate the USPTO web browser software and the hyperlink

becomes a live web link. It is respectfully submitted that the characters “www.radvision.com” alone, without the characters “http://,” do not constitute a hyperlink (i.e., web browser software is not activated if “http://” is not present).

The Examiner also stated in the telephone message (discussed above) that because web sites often appear and disappear with regularity, and can frequently change their URL addresses, merely providing the company name, Radvision, Ltd., and a URL maintained by the company, do not provide sufficient information within the specification for a subsequent reader to locate the company or the material provided on the web site. In response, the Applicants have included the address of Radvision, Ltd., so that the company to be more easily identified and located. The address of Radvision, Ltd. is available on the company’s web site. In addition, the document referred to in the specification (and mentioned above) is being filed herewith in an Information Disclosure Statement.

IV. Claims Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-18 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,356,876 (“Lingham”) in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,080,049 (“Truitt”). Applicants have amended claims 1, 5-6, 10, and 13-15 and respectfully traverse the rejection.

In one example of a system in accordance with the embodiment of the invention of claim 1, when a call is received from a caller, information in a first profile, which is associated with a billing telephone number (“BTN”), is used to determine whether the first profile or a second, different, profile is to be used to provide services during the call. The second profile may be associated with an automatic number identification (“ANI”), for example. The first profile also contains preferences not associated with billing, which may include preferred methods of information delivery, preferences relating to the movie preferences, preferred dining times, etc.

(Page 10, lines 11-16; page 11, lines 22-27). Preferences in the selected profile may be used to provide concierge services to the caller, for example.

Claims 1 and 10

Independent claim 1 defines a method for selecting a profile to use in servicing a call. Claim 1 requires “receiving a signaling stream associated with the call, the signaling stream including at least first and second identifiers, the first identifier containing data concerning an account to which the call is to be billed.” Claim 1 has been amended to require “maintaining first and second profiles identifiable by the first and second identifiers, respectively, the first profile comprising one or more preferences unrelated to billing and second data indicating whether the first profile or the second profile is to be used to provide one or more services during the call.” Claim 1 also requires “retrieving the first profile based on the first identifier,” and has been further amended to require “based on the second data, determining whether to use the first profile or the second profile to provide one or more services during the call.” Claims 4-6 and 9, which depend from amended claim 1, have been amended to conform to the language of amended claim 1.

Independent claim 10 is a system claim that corresponds to amended claim 1, and has been amended in a similar manner. Support for the amendments to claims 1 and 10 is found at page 4, pages 13-14, and Fig. 5, for example.

System claim 10 has also been amended to replace the language “an interface for” by “an interface configured to,” and the language “a database for” by “a database configured to,” and the language “a processor for” by “a processor configured to” to avoid any inference that the limitations should be interpreted as means-plus-function limitations. These amendments broaden

the scope of the claim. Claims 13-15 and 18, which depend from amended claim 10, have been amended to conform to the language of amended claim 10.

The Prior Art

Lingham discloses a prize reporting method and system for reporting the results of a contest to a caller. (Col. 1, lines 25-27). When a caller calls the reporting service, identification information for the calling terminal and/or calling party is obtained, such as an ANI received during the call. (Col. 3, lines 6-15). Other identification information (including a BTN) may also be obtained directly from the caller. Based on the identification information, a profile associated with the caller is retrieved from a profile database. (Col. 3, lines 16-29). The profile may include information such as the caller's annual salary, marital status, number of children, etc. (Col. 2, lines 53-57). A determination is then made whether the caller is a winner of the contest. (Col. 3, lines 29-39), and the caller is notified whether or not the caller is a winner.

Truitt discloses a system for processing payment of a transaction. When a user purchases goods from an online vendor via the Internet, the user provides his or her name, address, and home telephone number. (Col. 5, lines 30-42). The user can select an option to pay via his or her telephone account or credit cards. (Col. 5, lines 61-67). The system then attempts to authorize/validate the selected payment option. (Col. 7, lines 25-45). If the request is validated, the charge is billed to the selected payment option. (Col. 8, lines 40-43).

The Examiner admits on page 3 of the Office Action that Lingham does not teach or suggest using data in a "first profile" to determine "whether to use the first profile or the second profile." Truitt also fails to teach or suggest this limitation.

Nowhere does Truitt teach or suggest using data in one “profile,” such as in the claimed “first profile” associated with the first identifier containing data concerning an account to which the call is to be billed, to select from among a first and a second profile for use during a call. Truitt merely discloses presenting to a user an option to bill a purchase to a credit card or to a telephone number. The user makes the selection at the time of purchase. Truitt does not disclose making any determination whether to select one or another payment option based on data in a profile. This does not, therefore, teach or suggest “determining whether to use the first profile or the second profile” based on data in the first profile, as claimed.

In addition, Truitt’s method and system of determining how to bill a purchase are unrelated to providing “one or more services during the call,” as required by amended claims 1 and 10. The passage of Truitt cited in the Office Action discusses an “authorization event” that occurs in order to determine whether or not a particular transaction can be billed to the user’s telephone account, or BTN. (Col. 8, lines 40-49). As discussed above, the BTN is nothing more than a telephone number to which the call is to be billed, and is unrelated to providing “one or more services during a call,” as claimed.

Also, neither Lingham nor Truitt teaches or suggests “maintaining first and second profiles identifiable by the first and second identifiers, respectively, the first profile comprising one or more preferences unrelated to billing and data indicating whether the first profile or the second profile is to be used to provide one or more services during the call,” as required by amended claim 1, or a database configured to do so, as required by amended claim 10. While Lingham discloses receiving, during a telephone call, a user profile as well as other information such as a BTN and an ANI, there is no teaching or suggestion in Lingham of maintaining a profile containing “data indicating whether the first profile or the second profile is to be used to

provide one or more services during the call,” as claimed. Neither a BTN nor an ANI contains such information. Truitt also does not teach or suggest this limitation. As stated above, Truitt merely discloses a method for enabling a user to choose to bill a purchase to a credit card or to a telephone number. Nowhere does Truitt mention or suggest either maintaining a profile containing “one or more preferences unrelated to billing” or maintaining a profile containing “data indicating whether the first profile or the second profile is to be used to provide one or more services during the call,” as claimed.

Accordingly, amended claims 1 and 10, and their respective dependent claims, are patentable over the cited art.

V. New Claims 19-21

New claim 19 defines a method for selecting a profile to use in servicing a call. Claim 19 requires “receiving at least first and second identifiers during a call” and “maintaining a first profile associated with the first identifier, the first profile comprising billing information and at least one first preference unrelated to billing, and a second profile associated with the second identifier, the second profile comprising one or more second preferences.” Claim 19 also requires “retrieving the first profile based on the first identifier,” “receiving a request for one or more services,” and “based on data in the first profile, selecting the first profile or the second profile for providing the one or more requested services during the call.” Claim 19 further requires “providing the one or more requested services in accordance with the selected first or second profile.” Support for new claim 19 is found at page 4, lines 1-29 and page 10, lines 11-20, for example.

As discussed above, none of the cited references teaches or suggests using data in a first profile to select a first profile or a second profile to provide services during a call, as required by new claim 19. Therefore, new claim 19 is patentable over the cited art.

New claim 20 depends from claim 19 and further recites “wherein the at least one first preference includes at least one preference selected from a group consisting of: a preferred mode of delivery of information, a preferred restaurant, a preferred dining time, one or more dietary requirements, past logged activity, and a service subscription.” New claim 21 depends from claim 19 and further recites “wherein the one or more second preferences include at least one preference selected from a group consisting of: a preferred mode of delivery of information, a preferred restaurant, a preferred dining time, one or more dietary requirements, past logged activity, and a service subscription.” Support for new claims 20-21 is found at page 10, lines 11-20, for example.

For the reasons discussed above, new claim 19 is patentable over the cited art. Therefore, new claims 20-21, which depend from new claim 19, is also patentable over the cited art.

VI. Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, each of claims 1-21, as amended, is believed to be in condition for allowance. Accordingly, reconsideration of these claims is requested and allowance of the application is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: March 5, 2006

By:

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Brandon N. Sklar", written over a horizontal line.

Brandon N. Sklar
Reg. No. 31,667
(212) 836-8653

Kaye Scholer LLP
425 Park Avenue
New York, New York 10022